January 17, 2024
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

BY:	MAM
	DEPUTY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS SAN ANTONIO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

MENDEZ

ELAUDIO D'LUNA-

SA-22-CR-00367-OLG-ESC

ORDER ON REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

The Court has considered United States Magistrate Judge Elizabeth S. Chestney's Report and Recommendation (R&R), filed December 13, 2023, concerning Defendant's Amended Motion to Suppress. (See R&R, Dkt. No. 113.)

A party who wishes to object to a Magistrate Judge's findings and recommendations must serve and file specific written objections within fourteen days. FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(2). Defendant, through counsel, was electronically served with a copy of the R&R on December 13, 2023, and timely filed his objections on December 27, 2023. (See Dkt. No. 114.)

When a party objects to an R&R, the Court must make a de novo determination as to "any part of the magistrate judge's disposition that has been properly objected to." FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(3); see United States. v. Wilson, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989), cert. denied, 492 U.S. 918 (1989). Objections must be specific; frivolous, conclusory, or general objections need not be considered by the district court. Battle v. U.S. Parole Comm'n, 834 F.2d 419, 421 (5th Cir. 1987) (quoting Nettles v. Wainwright, 677 F.2d 404, 410 n.8 (5th Cir. 1982), overruled on other grounds by Douglass v. U.S. Auto. Ass'n, 79 F.3d 1415 (5th Cir. 1996)). Any portions of the Magistrate Judge's findings or recommendations that were not objected to are reviewed for clear error. Wilson, 864 F.2d at 1221.

The Court has reviewed de novo each portion of the R&R to which Defendant has objected and finds that the R&R is correct and should be accepted. Further, to the extent that there are portions of the R&R to which Defendant has not objected, the Court finds that the R&R is neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court ACCEPTS the Magistrate Judge's R&R (Dkt. No. 113) and, for the reasons set forth therein, Defendant's Amended Motion to Suppress (Dkt. No. 101) is **DENIED**.

It is so **ORDERED**.

SIGNED this _____ day of January, 2024.

ORLANDO L. GARCIA United States District Judge